



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

|  |             |                      |                        |                  |
|--|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO.                                  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.    | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/585,649                                       | 07/07/2006  | Karl Wilhelm Kramer  | 292811US0X PCT         | 5483             |
| 22850  | 7590        | 07/21/2008           | EXAMINER               |                  |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. |             |                      | HANNAHEIR, CONSTANTINE |                  |
| 1940 DUKE STREET                                 |             |                      | ART UNIT               | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314                             |             |                      | 2884                   |                  |
| NOTIFICATION DATE                                |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                        |                  |
| 07/21/2008                                       |             | ELECTRONIC           |                        |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

|                              |   |                         |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b>                  | <b>Applicant(s)</b>     |
|                              | 10/585,649                              | KRAEMER ET AL.          |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Constantine Hannaher | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2884 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s)       is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s)       is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s)       are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on       is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.      .
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/0256/06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date      

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date      

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Oath/Declaration**

1. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It is not plainly and legibly written either by a typewriter or machine printer in permanent dark ink or its equivalent, as required under 37 CFR 1.52(a)(1)(iv).

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 21, 23-30, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van Loef *et al.* (2002).

With respect to independent claim 21, van Loef *et al.* discloses a material (page 8482) which is within the scope of the recited formula because A=Rb, B=Li, M=Y or Lu or La, and X=Br. As made plain by van Loef *et al.* there is a recognized need for optical, scintillation, and magnetic properties in elpasolites and they offer a natural environment for the incorporation of Ce<sup>3+</sup>. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare the material with the trivalent cerium as a dopant as this is a pursuit of the known potential options with a reasonable expectation of success.

With respect to dependent claims 23-29, van Loef *et al.* identifies values for the recited "x" which anticipate the claimed range or make it obvious (page 8484) and identifies the production of monocrystals (page 8484) and the preparation of powders of various forms are known techniques recognized as the ordinary capabilities of one skilled in the art.

With respect to dependent claim 30, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare the material with rubidium as this is a pursuit of the known potential options (see page 8482) with a reasonable expectation of success in view of reaction (1).

With respect to independent claim 22, van Loef *et al.* discloses a material (page 8482) which is within the scope of the recited formula when z=0 and Ln=Y but for the use of chlorine and bromine as the halide. As made plain by van Loef *et al.* there is a recognized need for optical, scintillation, and magnetic properties in elpasolites and a finite number of halides ("X=F, Cl, Br, I"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to prepare the Ce<sup>3+</sup> doped material with iodine as this is a pursuit of the known potential options with a reasonable expectation of success.

**Response to Submission(s)**

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 5, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Since rubidium and iodine are entirely well-known in the preparation of elpasolites of the structure  $A_2BMX_6$ , see the seventh line of page 8482 in Loef *et al.*, the argument that the reference does not teach compositions with these elements is inadequate as a reply to the argument for obviousness made by the Examiner.

For at least the reasons explained above, Applicant is not entitled to a favorable determination of patentability in view of the arguments submitted June 5, 2008.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

6. Claims 1-20 are allowed.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Loef *et al.* explains (page 8483) that the lithium-containing elpasolites are possible candidates for neutron sensitive scintillators but this is inadequate to confirm utility as neutron detectors.

**Conclusion**

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Constantine Hannaher whose telephone number is (571) 272-2437. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with flexible hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (571) 272-2444. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Constantine Hannaher/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2884**